## REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the fluorine-containing polymer consists essentially of a perfluoropolymer. Support is found, for example, in the Examples of the present specification in which only perfluoropolymers are used.

Claims 9-11 directed to a non-elected invention have been canceled. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application directed to the canceled subject matter.

Also, entry of the amendments at this stage of prosecution is respectfully requested as placing the case in condition for allowance.

Review and reconsideration on the merits are requested.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent 6,380,313 to Dillon et al. for reasons of record.

Particularly, the Examiner considered the disclosure of Dillon et al. as meeting the terms of claims 1-4, 7 and 8, and further, cited the Examples of Dillon et al. as using perfluoropolymers within the scope of claim 1.

Applicants traverse, and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

The resin composition of amended claim 1 is prepared by formulating an engineering plastic with a fluorine-containing polymer in a specific mass ratio. The fluorine-containing polymer consists essentially of perfluoropolymer. As used in the present specification, the term "perfluoropolymer" means polymers obtained by polymerizing any of perfluoro monomers as

the monomer component to the exclusion of other types of monomer components. See the present specification at page 6, lines 18-21.

On the other hand, Dillon et al does not mention the use of a fluorine-containing polymer consisting essentially of perfluoropolymer as claimed. The Examiner considered that the fluorine-containing polymers of Example C3, 3, C6 and 6 in the cited document are respectively identical to those recited in present claim 1. However, the fluorine-containing polymers of the Examples are different as explained below. First, Examples 6 and C6 of Dillon et al use not only the modified fluoroelastomer (TFE/perfluoromethyl vinyl ether (PMVE) copolymer), but also the unmodified fluoropolymer of Example C2 (TFE/propylene copolymer), which is not a perfluoropolymer and which consists of 90 wt% of the total fluoropolymer. On the other hand, the former TFE/PAVE copolymer constitutes only 10 wt% of the total. Secondly, Examples C3 and 3 of Dillon et al use fluoropolymers other than perfluoropolymer. This is because the fluoropolymers are composed of vinylidene fluoride (see col. 11, Table in Dillon et al). Thus, the fluorine-containing polymer, which consists essentially of a perfluoropolymer, as recited in amended claim 1, is neither disclosed, described nor suggested by Dillon et al. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the resin composition of amended claim 1, which requires a fluorine-containing polymer consisting essentially of a perfluoropolymer, differs from the polymer processing additive composition of Dillon et al. Also, because claims 2-4, 7 and 8 include all of the limitations of claim 1, these claims also are not anticipated by Dillon et al for the same reason that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited prior art.

With respect to the underlying obviousness rejection of claims 1-4, 7 and 8, and also the rejection of claims 5, 6 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Dillon et al, Applicants respond as follows.

As shown above, Dillon et al does not teach or suggest a fluorine-containing polymer component consisting essentially of perfluoropolymer as required by amended claim 1.

Moreover, Dillon et al does not teach or suggest the specific mass ratio of an engineering plastic to the fluorine-containing polymer consisting essentially of a perfluoropolymer as required by amended claim 1. Thus, there is no motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the resin composition of amended claim 1 based on the disclosure of Dillon et al. For the same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and claims 2-8 and 12 including all of the limitations of claim 1 are also patentable over Dillon et al.

In response to the provisional rejection of claims 1-8 and 12 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of co-pending application No. 10/380,830, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to hold this rejection in abeyance until Application 10/380,830 is allowed.

Withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of claims 1-8 and 12, pending resolution of the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection, is earnestly solicited.

In the event that the Examiner believes that it may be helpful to advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number indicated below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Abraham J. Rosner
Registration No. 33,276

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 26, 2005